

A. READ
35, MARTINS LANE
WALTON

CANDOUR

The British Views - Letter

To serve as a link between Britons all over the world in protest against the surrender of their world heritage

Vol. XVIII, No. 463

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

April, 1967

PRINCE PHILIP AND THE BILDERBERGERS

By A. K. CHESTERTON

IT may be that the constant attention paid to the Bilderberg Group by *Candour*, and the chapter devoted to it in "The New Unhappy Lords", has had the effect of making this dubious outfit, although no less secretive as to what goes on at its meetings, at least somewhat less furtive about the fact that it exists. Indeed, its guard is down even to the extent of allowing its name to appear in the Court Circular, whence I extract this item:

"The Duke of Edinburgh arrived at Buckingham Palace this morning after attending the Bilderberg Meeting at St. John's Hall, Cambridge."

If the use of the singular was accurate, the meeting must have been a very long one, as it occupied no less than three days.

Throughout this period all visitors were turned away from St. John's, while the participants themselves appear to have been confined within its precincts. Porters barred the main gates and other entrances were either locked or watched by college staff. Porters were also patrolling the grounds. Such security precautions were all part of the Bilderberg tradition, except that one would have expected the college staff to be replaced for the occasion by another from afar, recruited Heaven knows where, just as Heaven alone knows who appoints the actual participants.

TRADITIONAL "DISCLOSURE"

Also conforming to Bilderberg tradition was the "disclosure" of the Conference spokesman that more than ninety delegates were attending from different parts of the world, "their aim being to reduce the differences of opinion, and to find a common approach to the various problems of international affairs." Politicians, economists and businessmen were of course present, but never an official word, needless to say, about international financiers. The Extel communique was a little, but not much, more expansive—adding the word "intellectuals" and mentioning the arrival of such dignitaries as Denis Healey, Edward Heath, Aristotle Onassis and Stavros Niarchos.

The *Daily Mail* supplied the extra information that the talks would be about economic, political and military problems on which the "delegates" could talk

openly—in secret. Use of the word "delegates" was also made by the *Sunday Times*, which—greatly privileged—took photograph of some of them, published under the heading "The Secret Bilderbergers" and above a caption which read:

"Some of the most high-powered people—politically and economically—in the world have convened at St. John's College, Cambridge, for the annual secret sessions of the Bilderberg conference. . . . The delegates attend privately, not in their official capacities. No record of the proceedings is released and the Press is barred."

All this, for the Bilderbergers, is publicity on an orgiastic scale.

WHOSE "DELEGATES" ?

The thoughtful reader, however, will be puzzled by many questions which are certain to remain unanswered. First of all there is the word "delegate". To be a delegate, with submission, it is necessary to have some task or power conferred upon one by an organisation or by some other person or persons. Who invests the members of the Bilderberg Group with authority to speak or act on its behalf? Whose delegate is Mr. Onassis, say, or Mr. Healey, or Mr. David Rockefeller, or Mr. Dean Acheson, or—for that matter—the Duke of Edinburgh? As the "delegates" attend privately, they cannot very well be Government representatives. Whom, then, do they represent? The Power Elite? That would be my own guess. Who meets the considerable expense of bringing under one roof over ninety people from both sides of the Atlantic? Nobody, we may be certain, who does not stand to gain power or profit from the exercise.

And why the secrecy? Is there any British defence problem which Denis Healey wishes to expound for the benefit of Aristotle Onassis, a backer of the terrorist Makarios, but which must not be revealed to the British people who pay the Minister his salary? Does Heath under seal of confidence feel more free to tell David Rockefeller his treasonable plans to transfer British sovereignty from the British Crown and Parliament to some European Economic Community cabal than he would be in telling them to an assembly of stout-hearted British patriots? From the gathering at St. John's

College, Cambridge, there emanates what has arisen from every Bilderberg conference ever since the group was formed—the exhalation of things hidden, the evil odour of intrigue, the stench of conspiracy.

How comes it that His Royal Highness Prince Philip has been enticed into this cosmopolitan underworld, where the creatures of the internationalist power-masters plot against the sovereignty of every nation? The question leads us, albeit with the greatest reluctance, to examine the Prince's record to ascertain the direction of his thoughts and to ask the further question—what has he ever done to further the cause of British independence and freedom?

Educated at Gordonstoun (where he was later to send the Heir to the Throne), Prince Philip early came under the influence of its headmaster, Kurt Hahn, a German Jewish refugee for whom Federal Union was the ruling political passion. As exemplar, he had Uncle Mountbatten, whose insouciance in handing over the Indian sub-continent to the slaughtering of millions of innocent people made the Emperor Nero seem by comparison a grave and responsible ruler.

It was no wonder that the Queen's Consort should have aped the Mountbatten manner when he flew to Dar-es-Salaam, not to honour the graves of the Empire's fighting-men who had died while wrenching the territory from the Germans, but to crack cheap jokes with Nyerere as the Union Jack was lowered into the Tanganyikan dust. It was not even cause for wonder when he flew to Nairobi, not to congratulate those who had tamed that land and made it prosperous, but to hand them over—which he did with the same deplorable flippancy—to the alcohol-crazed "leader to darkness and death".

CUT AND THRUST

FOREIGN Office Minister of State George Thomson declares that Britain's attitude towards the United Nations is one of "constructive discontent". Feebly parodying Butler's crack at Anthony Eden, he says: "It is the best United Nations we have, but the constant aim of our policy is to make it better and better until it can become an effective peace-keeping agency, a World Government." It is a queer sign of the times that the more putrid an institution shows its foundations to be, the more irresistible is the temptation of our block-headed politicians to plan for it what they believe to be a grandiose superstructure.

As a peace-keeping force the United Nations showed what it could do by letting loose the rapists of Ethiopia, Ghana and—I regret to say—Sweden upon the unfortunate people of Katanga. If its record in Cyprus is rather better, the reason is that the effective work there is being done by British troops whose presence under the Union Jack was a crime against humanity, but whose service under the pale blue and white Zionist colours is held to be of inestimable value to mankind. Now we have had the absurdity of a representative of each of those mighty powers, Venezuela, Afghanistan and Mali forming a commission to straighten out the tangled skein at Aden. Although after arriving there

Indeed the Prince, or those who manipulate him, could not even resist the temptation a week or two ago to make internationalist propaganda out of the otherwise moving commemorative service at Vimy Ridge. His Royal Highness chose, or was chosen, to use the occasion to place the blame for the World War on nationalism and to equate nationalism with "the aggressive instincts of a people". What the Prince forgot, if he ever knew, was that had there been no British nationalists, no French nationalists, no Canadian nationalists to stand athwart the path of German nationalists, Germany would have triumphed and Great Britain today would not be placing planes and helicopters at his disposal to ensure that, come what may, His Serene Highness does not miss his game of polo at Cowdray Park.

What Prince Philip also does not know, and may be incapable of perceiving, is that what external foes have failed to do by force of arms—destroy Britain's sovereign independence—a more subtle enemy is now doing, by undermining our means of survival through squalid secret societies such as the Bilderberg Group. If this be true, it follows that those Britons who adhere to them are the most lethal Fifth Column our country has ever harboured.

To many people the association of the Prince's name with the Bilderbergers will be a guarantee of their political respectability. To others of us—and it is both difficult and painful to write such things—the effect will be quite the opposite. Henceforward we shall look upon these cloak-and-daggers boys with an even deeper mistrust, not because we regard Prince Philip as a man of evil intentions, but because his attitudes proclaim him to be the perfect stooge for the sinister task allotted to him by the promoters of One World.

they complained of the strictness of British security measures, it was noticed that, free as they were to wander about as they pleased, they ventured to leave the hotel only twice in five days, so that they were perhaps not so unappreciative of their British protectors as they found it politic later to assert.

* * *

Aden at the time was in a state of turmoil, so that the concern of this absurd trio for their own skins is understandable. That they would have to confer with the Federal Government if their mission was to make sense was obvious. No less obvious (at least so optimists would suppose) was that they were in Aden to examine the situation, not to make propaganda broadcasts. Their refusal to talk with the Federal Ministers and the Federal decision to withhold from them the freedom of the air led to their departing at speed for Geneva, which had the great advantage of being free of sniper's bullets and terrorist's bombs. That there were no Aden functionaries in Switzerland available for consultation mattered not at all.

Yet the ludicrous British Government took the business seriously enough to send to Aden Lord Shackleton, Minister Without Portfolio, to deal with the situation

caused by the antics of the U.N. delegation—a slap in the eye, no doubt, for Sir Richard Turnbull, who had done his job sufficiently well to ensure that the trio left the territory in one piece. The moral should surely be for the British to put down terrorism and remain in Aden as long as there are British interests in the Persian Gulf to be protected, remnants of British influence in Malaysia to be safeguarded and strategical links with Australasia to be maintained. Instead, the tempo of scuttle will be stepped up and Mr. George Thomson will continue to repose his faith in World Government, whose chief bureaucratic functionaries could well be the gentlemen from Venezuela, Afghanistan and Mali, who did at least do Aden the service of clearing out as soon as they heard the whistle of bullets through the streets!

* * *

The new Establishment in Great Britain—that is to say, the complex of interests wielding political and economic power in the land, and especially the part of the complex most closely allied to the drive towards monopoly, can best be identified by following the activities of people whom one learns to look upon as lynch-pins in the set-up. One such man is undoubtedly Sir Eric Roll, until a few months ago the Permanent under-Secretary to the Department of Economic Affairs. No sooner had he retired than he was appointed to the board of Dominion Lincoln Assurance, the British front of a titanic American insurance outfit. Almost simultaneously he became an executive director of S. G. Warburg and a director of Mercury Securities, which has a controlling interest in that bank. Sigmund Warburg, it will be remembered, is a personal friend of Harold Wilson and his chief unofficial adviser on defence expenditure.

Other directorships to be dished out to Sir Eric on a silver tray were those of the Bank of London and South America and of Bunzl Pulp and Paper. Then, as soon as Lord Thomson made his successful take-over bid for *The Times*, who should enrich the board of the newly formed Times Newspapers Ltd. but Sir Eric Roll! Not even then did he cry "Hold! Enough!" The acquisition by Chrysler of Rootes was celebrated by the appointment of Sir Eric to the Rootes board. The worthy knight is beyond doubt a key-figure in contemporary Britain.

* * *

Britons are perhaps greatly reassured by the knowledge that there is a fellow-countryman thus placed at the heart of things. Sigmund Warburg is no doubt a delightful fellow, but his name is scarcely British and with the best will in the world he may have difficulty in deciding how best the British future can be served. Then there are Dr. Balogh and Professor Kaldor. Delightful fellows, too, and as full of economic expertise as they are of charm. But having been born in Hungary, are they now so steeped in British tradition that we can be certain that their powerful influence upon the framing of the Government's economic policies must inevitably serve the cause of Britain's sovereign independence?

Ah well, why worry? Have we not Sir Eric Roll at the centre of things, to ensure that the British national interest is properly understood? Alas and alack, there's no great comfort to be found here. Sir Eric seems not to have considered his place of origin to be of sufficient

importance to record in the reference books. The sad truth is that this knightly consolidator of take-over bids is not a son of Britain. He, too, is of Eastern European descent. He was probably also born in Hungary, a deduction one would not make after studying his face, which contains no Magyar features. Ashkenazim, rather, I would guess. As Harold Wilson has proclaimed the whole world kin it perhaps gives him great satisfaction that the livelihood of this once great country should now be determined by cosmopolitan bankers and advisers. But the rest of us find the idea less fascinating than he does.

* * *

The *Observer* and *Daily Telegraph* both assert that Rhodesia is under pressure from South Africa to come to terms with the British Government. Here is how the *Telegraph* analyses the situation:

"The South African Republic has every sympathy with Mr. Smith's desire to maintain white dominance in Rhodesia. But Mr. Smith had better be aware of South African political philosophy if he imagines he can put his whole weight on the Republic. Mr. Vorster, South African Prime Minister, has already given a warning that there could be no question of an alliance among white men in the Republic, Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique. In fact, he has shown specifically that he wants good relations with Zambia, Malawi, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. . . . The Republic is not concerned with supporting a particular form of government among its neighbours. The idea of white domination has been rejected, and the idea of white domination over the whole of Rhodesia would be contrary to the policy of the Republic."

There is more realism in that summing-up than is generally realized.

The editor-in-chief of *Die Burger*, mouthpiece of the Cape Nationalists, wrote after mandatory sanctions had been imposed that U.D.I. was an empty shell and that by refusing to "return to legality" Rhodesia could become an embarrassment to her neighbours. Too many Rhodesians, I think, are fooling themselves. The same thing goes for their friends across the Limpopo. How many South Africans understand that there has been a radical change in their own governmental policy during the last six years? Perhaps not more than one in every twenty.

* * *

I am informed that a photograph recently appeared in the "Times of Zambia" purporting to show the shocking conditions which prevail in Rhodesia. It depicted African children scrabbling in dustbins, the caption being "Starving Children in Rhodesia". The effect upon the innocent must have been all that could have been desired, suggesting as it did that the Rhodesian Front Government had reduced the country to an intolerable state of poverty.

However, not everybody is quite as innocent as these blatant propagandists like to believe. The street in which the picture was taken was identified as Stanley Street in Lusaka and it has since been discovered that a Press photographer gathered the children together, took them to the area, placed a

number of "tickey" pieces (small threepenny coins) in the bins, bade the youngsters use the bins as lucky dips and then photographed the result. The idea is unlikely to have arisen in African minds. Debased Europeans have much to answer for in the exploitation of gathering chaos which in any event will assuredly add to the miseries of a primitive people without the intervention of slick operators from Europe or of European origin.

* * *

Unfortunately faked photographs are not the only things that Zambians have learnt from the West. Thus Kenneth Kaunda, referring to some recent deportations, spoke of them as "a purge of human vermin". "Vermin" would sound very much more horrifying were it not for one's recollection that this was the way the late Aneurin Bevan chose to describe his opponents in Westminster. The cause of the Zambian deportations was the incident in which a Lusaka butcher was accused of having sold to the wife of the Vice-President, Kamanga, a rotten chicken. This turned out to be a turkey which the good lady had forgotten to put in the refrigerator, but that fact did not prevent members of Kaunda's party marching on the butchery and wrecking it. The Youth Leader in command was jailed for a year, but Kaunda personally intervened and ordered his release.

The butcher then began a civil action for damage to his shop, whereupon the Government tried to deport him, a process which for a time was halted through the action of a Lusaka barrister, Colin Cunningham, whose efforts led to his own deportation. Later, gangs surrounded the house of Mrs. Cunningham shouting threats at her and when finally she arrived at Salisbury she was found to be suffering from severe shock.

* * *

Once Mr. Cunningham was out of the country he really spoke his mind. Describing him as "a frightened man" he said that Kaunda would make a very good Scoutmaster, in which role his capabilities would be fully extended. This reflects very unfairly on the Scouts. He also said: "God-like power has been given to people in Zambia who are incompetent to use it", adding: "If you asked the British people to allow a preparatory school to run the Government the British would laugh and think it a huge joke. But that is exactly what they have done in Zambia." Another remark made by Mr. Cunningham was that some of his colleagues in Zambia were cowards, being frightened to speak out about the way justice was being administered in the country. He said that when he first went to Zambia from Britain about twelve years ago justice was generally "fair and just".

That statement should be placed on the record. Whatever sympathy one may feel for the deported advocate, he should be asked what he himself did to maintain British rule in the country. If my memory does not fail me, he was the leading figure behind the formation of the abortive Rhodesian Republican Party. More chickens than Mrs. Kamanga's bird have come home, if not to roost, then at least to languish outside a refrigerator. I wonder how many more will follow

when the eight seats in the legislature reserved for Europeans are abolished!

* * *

Not content with supporting fatuous and subversive causes in the United Kingdom, the Archbishop of York has recently been spreading his pestiferous ideas in Australasia. Thus, in an address at Christchurch, he said that the best method of showing New Zealanders what hunger and poverty meant was for families to take in a destitute child from Pakistan or India. That is true enough: within a couple of generations the entire country would be reduced to famine. To say nothing of being converted to Islam!

Dr. Coggan justified his remarks by declaring that the Christian Church had a right and a duty to speak on social issues, especially when they are moral issues. The will of a people to survive is a social issue. What right has the Archbishop to undermine it? Help of the weak by the strong is a moral issue. What duty has the Archbishop to suggest that the strong would better discharge this obligation by first reducing themselves to impotence and beggary? Is it not time that His Grace began to think and talk like a man, instead of like a half-baked, brainwashed hack?

* * *

One of the most nauseating statements possible to imagine was made by Mr. William Wilson, M.P., on his return from a visit to the German Democratic Republic, which is the euphemistic name given to Eastern Germany. Said Mr. Wilson: "As an M.P. for Coventry, a town twinned with Dresden, I had a place of honour at a mass meeting commemorating the great raid on Dresden which took place 22 years ago and almost obliterated the city." "Commemorate" my dictionary defines as "celebrate, to preserve the memory of". Who would wish to celebrate the bombing of Dresden? The Communists, perhaps, for it was they who called upon their allies for this hellish act. "Great." What was there great about the infamy?

It would be interesting to know who "twinned" Coventry and Dresden. Coventry was a key industrial city contributing hugely to the British war effort. Dresden, on the other hand, had no war industry and was therefore not a military target as civilized men understood the term. Yet scores of thousands of non-combatants were burnt alive in Dresden cellars. General Sir Frederick Morgan told me that he would have been able to stop the diabolical raid had it not been that the order for it "came from the very top". This I took to mean Roosevelt and surmised that behind Roosevelt stood the sinister figure of Bernard Baruch. I can think of nothing more contemptuous to say of William Wilson than that he richly deserved the "place of honour" of which he boasts.

* * *

"I am a Conservative but I support the Labour Government in Britain. I believe newspapers are too Tory. I like to see my papers Labour-minded because Labour represents the people." These words were spoken by Lord Thomson in a television interview in Australia.

Familiar as double-speak is, nowadays, it is seldom that those who indulge in it are as frank as all that. Perhaps it is to be escalated from a technique for deception and confusion to be made a respectable proposition in logic!

* * *

To some people, of course, even single-speak is a very difficult art to master. I have in mind at the moment an aspiring youth who describes himself as the Press Officer of the Newcastle Young Liberals association. In reply to a letter from a Mr. W. L. Wilson deploring the lack of patriotism shown by the three main parties, published in a local paper, the Press Officer, after giving a boost to "the true merits of Socialism"—scarcely the job of a Liberal propagandist, one would have thought—asserts that patriotism and nationalism and "their fellows racialism and supranationalism are, as an end in themselves, intrinsically evil". Britain, this strange young man thinks, has never been great and can only become so after "the abandonment of racial and national identity—but not character". How racial and national character can be preserved after the destruction of identity he does not explain.

Instead, he says that Liberals believe in the grouping of the Western countries with the Soviet Union to form "a super-nation". Nobody can have told the young man of Newcastle that the adjective of "super-nation", a concept which enchants him, is "supranational", which he abominates. If the way to greatness lies in political befuddlement and verbal confusion the young Liberals on Tyneside seem to be favoured by a leader well-equipped to blaze the trail—providing, of course, that greatness can be persuaded to retain its character while obliterating its identity!

* * *

Lord Fenner Brockway—presumably he allowed himself to be elevated to the upper House to prove to the Peers of the Realm that they, too, partook of human equality and formed part of the Brotherhood of Man—has written for the *Morning Star* (late *Daily Worker*) an article praising Kwame Nkrumah and the pristine loveliness of his political vision. Describing him as "an old friend" of his, Brockway said that "more than any other African leader, Kwame Nkrumah was impelled by a deep-rooted Socialistic philosophy. His advocacy of unity and Socialism as the only solution for Africa made him a man ten years ahead of his time."

Not, of course, that His Lordship approves of everything this Black Sir Galahad did. He had reservations about the imprisonment without trial of political opponents, and also about the "personality cult"—for which, weirdly, he blamed the Ghanaian Press. Nkrumah's trouble, it seems, was that he "failed to get over the Socialist purposes behind what was being done." One thing Brockway did not mention—Nkrumah's demand for a ten per cent rake-off on all foreign contracts. This was so notorious, as British businessmen have since testified, that the bribe became a built-in part of their tenders. His Lordship should explain to what part of Socialist doctrine such transactions belong. "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," perhaps!

The following letter has been sent by Bertrand Russell to the friend of a *Candour* supporter: "Contrary to the impression which may have been given by *The Observer* on Sunday, 12th March, the libel laws prevent the publication of almost everything I should wish to say about Mr. Wilson. In two short years the Prime Minister has broken almost every election pledge he ever made, publicly applauded the systematic destruction of the Vietnamese peasantry and taken over, lock, stock and barrel the policies and practices of his Tory opponents. To encourage him in these efforts he first increased his salary to £280 per week plus expenses and then insisted on the poverty of almost everybody else. In the past eighty years I have met or corresponded with probably every Prime Minister since Mr. Gladstone. My belief that Mr. Gladstone was the greatest Prime Minister is equalled only by my certainty that Mr. Wilson is the most despicable. If I were to meet him in Hell I should have the greatest difficulty in shaking his hand."

Statements contained in letters can be as defamatory as those appearing in print, especially as the person defamed rarely has the opportunity of securing retribution. That is why *Candour* offers the Prime Minister the opportunity, if he should wish to seize it, of seeking redress. Strictly neutral so far as such a dog-fight is concerned, we should sit back listening with sardonic amusement to the snarls and counter-snarls. Lord Russell seems to be in no doubt about his final destination and that of his adversary. Harold Wilson may perhaps feel a certain consolation in the fact that in that climate the frozen mitt would at least do something to mitigate the heat!

A.K.C.

NATIONAL FRONT SPIRIT

The following letter to the secretary of the National Front admirably expresses the spirit which this movement seeks to arouse in the British people:

Becoming 70 years old this year, I am unable to take on any active part in your organisation, but am wholeheartedly in favour of any movement that has as its aims the restoration of honour, pride, decency and greatness to our country. In pursuance of which purposes I have written many letters (some of which have been published) from time to time to both the national and local press supporting all the major points of the anti-Left Wing policy of your movement, and seldom fail to spread the gospel of patriotism, cleanliness, discipline, and respect for the great names, traditions and institutions that made this country what it was before it fell into the hands of the little Englanders, the bulk of whom crawled out of their bolt-holes after both the Great Wars of this century and reaped the rewards, and wore the laurels of a victory won for them by such as Ian Smith and his Rhodesian volunteers, the South African regiments, and all those others who left everything that they had in their own far off countries to come to fight and help to ensure the survival of what they then firmly regarded as the Mother Country.

I enclose a stamped and addressed envelope for your acknowledgements.

A. H. Morris.

CITY COUNCIL WITHDRAWS "NEW UNHAPPY LORDS"

UNDER a double-column, three-decker headline "Librarian on Troublesome Books" the *Cape Argus* publishes the following report:

The City Librarian (Mr. C. H. Vermeulen) has reported to the Cape Town City Council on his policy in the selection of books for the municipal library shelves following objections received at the non-stocking of a book entitled *The New Unhappy Lords* by A. K. Chesterton.

Mr. Vermeulen wrote in reply to a letter of complaint from a reader that the library's book selection committee was not happy about supplying the book, because it expressed 'an anti-semitic point of view in a biased and propagandistic way.'

He added: 'While it is our policy when selecting books to try to represent all points of view fairly and impartially, we have learnt from hard experience that books too violently polemical one way or the other cause us endless troubles.'

Rightly or wrongly, readers tended to blame the library authorities for disseminating a policy or philosophy, often not observing that the opposite viewpoint was also represented on the shelves.

EXTREMIST VIEWS

'Extremist points of view presented in a manner lacking scholarly objectivity, a reasonable degree of balance and detachment, provoke an equally strong and extreme reaction. I feel I am acting within my rights here in declining to have the City Libraries embroiled in violent controversy. I think that a policy of non-involvement in disputes conducted on this level is in the best interests of this institution,' Mr. Vermeulen said.

He said the book had been bought following a request from the Rondebosch Library for it. Although the book selection committee was not happy with it, it was supplied to the Rondebosch Library and left to circulate there. As expected, a complaint about the contents of the book was received three weeks after it was placed on the shelves. The book was then withdrawn.

Following this reply to a reader's request, Mr. Vermeulen has reported to the City Council's Amenities Committee that the matter raised the question of the degree to which the public's demands for books should be complied with.

'I would like to be reassured that my actions in such cases meet with the approval of the Amenities Committee. I shall be grateful, therefore, if the confirmation

of the committee for this policy can be obtained,' he said.

At its meeting today, the Amenities Committee confirmed the action of Mr. Vermeulen in having the book withdrawn from circulation on the library's shelves.

The chairman (Mr. A. F. Keen) said: 'We are not running a library to spread propaganda. We have withdrawn the book because it is anti-semitic.'

CANDOUR LEAGUE ENTERPRISE

Moyna Traill-Smith, hon. secretary of the Candour League of South Africa, was swift off the mark to take advantage of the situation. She inserted this advertisement in the Cape papers:

The Book the Libraries
Consider Dynamite!

The New Unhappy Lords

By A. K. CHESTERTON

Order your copy now and satisfy yourself that this exposure of international power politics should NOT be suppressed.

Three Editions* already sold out
Price R1.05 post free from
Candour Publishing Co.

c/o Penrose, 5 Albion Road, Rondebosch, C.P.

*Special autographed, clothbound and paperback editions—Ed.

The *Cape Argus* began a follow-up of the original report in these words:

"Sales of the book 'The New Unhappy Lords' by A. K. Chesterton have rocketed since the book was withdrawn from city libraries on the grounds that it was anti-semitic.

"Two city booksellers reported today that copies of the book had been sold out. New copies had been ordered, but would not be available in the city until next month.

"A Rondebosch publishing company is advertising copies of the book at R1.05 each. Three editions of the book have already been sold out."

AUTHOR'S REPLY

As soon as the matter was brought to his attention A. K. Chesterton air-mailed the following letter to the editor of the *Cape Argus*, which was published on April 17:

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

	Per Annum	Per Half-Year
Open Envelope	21s.	12s. 6d.
Closed Envelope	22s. 6d.	13s. 6d.
Air Mail	25s.	15s.

Sir,

I request the courtesy of your space to reply to the attack on my book *THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS* made by the City Librarian reported in your issue of April 4. Mr. Vermeulen gives as his excuse for withholding it from circulation: "Extreme points of view presented in a manner lacking scholarly objectivity, a reasonable degree of balance and detachment, provoke an equally strong and extreme reaction." The theme of the book is the operation of power politics in the modern world, a subject to which I have given thirty-four years of intensive research. If there were any evidence that Mr. Vermeulen had given a single day's study to this highly complex subject, his opinion about the alleged lack of scholarly objectivity might have some claim to being considered valid. As he does not challenge a single fact or attempt to expose any fallacy in my line of argument, the deduction may be made that he would find himself out of his depth were he to depart from his method of general denigration. I challenge him to quote a single statement I have made which could fairly be described as unbalanced or extremist.

Mr. A. F. Keen, Chairman of the City Council's Amenities Committee, was less circuitous. "We have

withdrawn the book," he said, "because it is anti-Semitic." That is no doubt the crux of the matter. I write in my book that the vast majority of Jews are law-abiding citizens leading highly respectable lives, and I go out of my way to associate Gentiles at every level with the attack on national sovereignty and pride of race which my book exposes. Because I mention certain Jews whose influence is subversive I am charged with being anti-Semitic, whereas it does not occur either to Mr. Vermeulen or to Mr. Keen to describe me as being anti-Gentile, which would be quite as logical—or illogical. I cannot subscribe to the view that World Jewry of all mankind should be immune from criticism, but in so far as I have written such sentences as "To visit upon the mass of Jews opprobrium, or worse, because of the actions of those we are about to discuss is not only unfair but infamous" I repudiate Mr. Vermeulen's charge of lacking scholarly objectivity. It would appear that the real objection to the book is that it draws attention to certain truths which certain interests desire to be suppressed.

Yours faithfully,

A. K. Chesterton.

B.B.C. BOLTS FOR SHELTER

THE following correspondence between the B.B.C. and the Joint Vice-Chairman of the Executive Directorate of the National Front tells its own story and points its own moral:

Dear Mr. Brooks,

With reference to our telephone conversation, the BBC would appreciate it if you could afford us facilities to make a short film at one of your meetings in the near future.

This is for use in connection with a discussion programme which we hope to mount later in the year dealing with various aspects of nationalism.

You mentioned that you hoped to hold an election meeting at Ealing in connection with the GLC elections, and from our point of view this would be a good opportunity.

I look forward to hearing from you whether this proposal meets with your consent.

Yours sincerely,

A. G. Chivers,

Production Assistant BBC.

Dear Mr. Chivers,

Thank you for your letter regarding the proposed programme on nationalism. I have now had a chance to discuss this with one or two of my colleagues.

To be frank with you, it has been the common experience of me and my colleagues that the B.B.C. has a built-in internationalist bias, and that when it projects a programme on nationalism—other than so-called "African Nationalism" or "Asian Nationalism"—it does so for the purpose of trying to discredit nationalists. It has been suggested, therefore, that I should ask for your personal assurance that no such purpose underlies the projected programme about which you have written and which we discussed on the telephone.

It has also been our experience that the technique of

"smear by association" is frequently employed in such programmes. I have therefore been asked to ask you what other bodies or individuals you are proposing to include under the heading of "Nationalist" for the purpose of this programme, and whether steps will be taken to make it unmistakably clear that distinctions should be drawn between these various bodies and individuals.

Some years ago the League of Empire Loyalists was asked to co-operate in a B.B.C. television broadcast, and agreed to do so after being given verbally the personal assurance of the person responsible for the production of the programme that no "smear exercise" was intended and that the League would be given "a fair crack of the whip". This personal assurance was flagrantly dishonoured. The person in question, however, was a professional politician, not a B.B.C. production assistant, whose word we would take much more readily.

If you are able to give us your assurance that no "smear exercise" is intended, and that the purpose of the programme is not to discredit nationalism or nationalists, perhaps we might meet, with one of my colleagues, to discuss the matter further.

Yours sincerely,

Austen Brooks,

*Joint Vice-Chairman
Executive Directorate.*

Dear Mr. Brooks,

Thank you for your letter of 23rd March. As you don't seem too enthusiastic about our project and way of going about this, it would probably be better to let the matter drop. I am sorry to have troubled you and am very grateful for your prompt and considered reply.

Yours sincerely,

A. G. Chivers,

*Production Assistant
"Your Witness".*

So much for objectivity!

NATIONAL FRONT

ON the invitation of the Policy Directorate, Mr. John Bean, editor of *Combat* and the former National Organiser of the British National Party, has become a member of the Executive Directorate of the National Front.

Ealing

National Front candidates contesting Ealing in the Greater London Council election were easily first among the "minority group" candidates. John Bean, with 2,164 votes, Brian Holbrook (1,690) and Gerald Kemp (1,665), though trailing behind the massive votes of the Tories (over 50,000 each) and the Socialists (over 35,000), were well ahead of the Union Movement, Communist and Socialist Party of Great Britain candidates, whose votes ranged from 1,290 (U.M.) to 441 (S.P.G.B.). The Liberals, despite their established party machine, polled on average fewer than 5,000 votes each.

The result offers definite encouragement when it is remembered that the National Front had been in existence only two months at the time of the poll. Further encouragement came from the large number of enquiries for information about the movement's policies from voters in the Borough, a number of whom sent stamps for specimen copies of *Candour* and *Combat*.

Candour offers its congratulations to the three candidates, whose hard work to earn this encouragement deserves the gratitude of all members of the National Front. Hearty congratulations also go to their election agent, Mr. Ted Cruikshank, of Shepperton, to whose untiring efforts all three candidates have paid repeated tribute during the campaign.

Sheffield

Members of the Sheffield Branch of the National Front are contesting several seats in the local elections, in which polling day is May 11th. Active assistance is urgently required. Sympathisers willing to help are asked to get in touch with:

The Elections Officer,
N.F. Sheffield Area H.Q.,
347 Shalesmoor,
SHEFFIELD 3

to which address contributions to the local election fund should also be sent. 347 Shalesmoor is also the address of the movement's Sheffield bookshop.

Leeds

Mr. Phil Stone is contesting the Armley Ward in Leeds in the local election. Supporters in the area wishing to help are asked to contact Mr. Stone at 33, Grasmere Place, Armley, Leeds, 12.

Canterbury

Mr. Gerald Rowe is standing as a National Front candidate for the Dane John Ward of Canterbury. Anyone able to help is asked to contact him at 19 St. John's Lane, Canterbury, Kent, particularly anybody with a car available on Saturday, 29th April.

Dover

Mr. Peter Jarman is standing as a National Front candidate in Dover. Anyone able to help please contact him at 13 Clarendon Street, Dover, particularly anybody with a car available on Saturday, 6th May.

THE RUSH HAS BEGUN

The second and revised edition of A. K. Chesterton's "New Unhappy Lords" will be available at the beginning of May in Great Britain and later in the month overseas.

Hundreds of orders have already been received. To make sure that yours are met you should apply at once to:

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

11 PALACE CHAMBERS,
BRIDGE STREET, LONDON, S.W.1

PRICES

Cloth-bound Edition 25/-

Paper-back Edition 10/6

Trade discounts for all bulk orders.

There will be in addition a very special autographed edition-de-luxe, limited to 100 copies, selling at three guineas each.

By helping to secure the widest possible distribution of "The New Unhappy Lords" readers have the satisfaction of knowing that they are disseminating the truth about the international conspiracy against Christendom in the clearest, most concise and yet most comprehensive form ever to be published.